



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

needed, would not allow themselves to be swept away by the war-spirit, that growth would be rapidly forwarded in the creation of a moral sentiment in the community which would be a real guarantee of peace; for the public conscience has greater power than material force, and is the actual safeguard of law and order. It has been truly said that "The goddess of peace would get to her throne much faster than she does, if every man who really believes that war is unholy and abominable would seriously take in hand his six nearest neighbors."

The especial obligation under which the people of the United States rest to act as the peacemakers of the world is a point which has been often urged, but which cannot be too strongly insisted upon, more particularly at a time when this duty is being lost sight of in the spread of a military mania which would rob the nation of the advantages of its unique position by impelling it into a career at utter variance with its most cherished institutions.

A country freed by geographical isolation from entangling complications with other countries should be the natural mediator of peoples, since it occupies, to a great extent, the vantage ground of neutral territory, while at the same time it should be able to demonstrate that high attainments are rendered possible where the development of natural resources and national ability is unimpeded by the clog of a huge military system. But the point of especial significance lies in the example afforded by a great federation of states bound together for mutual benefit, with the agreement that peaceful settlements of such questions as arise among them shall be reached through decisions based upon public law and voiced by a Supreme Court. Just in proportion as this peaceful federation is successful does it prefigure the possibility of the formation of a similar union on a yet more extended scale, in which nations shall submit to the jurisdiction of a tribunal sustaining the same relation to the whole world which the Supreme Court of the United States sustains to the States of this Union.

In tracing the growth of methods in nation making, John Fiske points out that groups of men have coalesced into large political aggregates in three ways, indicating successive stages of advance:

By "conquest without incorporation," where the conquered tribe has been annexed without admission to any share in the government; by "conquest with incorporation," where the annexed neighbors have been gradually permitted to take part in the government; lastly by federation which he pronounces to be the highest method of forming great political bodies, and the only method in which the element of fighting is not an essential. "Here," he says, "there is no conquest, but a voluntary union of small political groups into a great political group. Each little group preserves its local independence intact, while forming part of an indissoluble whole. It is the method which contains every element of permanence, and which is pacific in its very conception."

One hundred years ago Immanuel Kant saw this same thing when, in his great treatise on "Perpetual Peace," he declared that universal peace could come only with the universal republic, because republican institutions lead, by their very nature, to habits of peace and law. He looked for the first step to be taken when it should

happen that a powerful and enlightened people should form itself into a republic. He said that this would form a nucleus of federative union for other nations to connect themselves with. The conditions of freedom according to international right would thus be secured, and the federation, through the adhesion of other peoples, might be extended more and more. So the international state would come into being.

Does he not foreshadow a mission for our country, higher and nobler than that of imperialism with its attendant militarism?

A plea has been often made to women, urging that it especially devolves upon them to work for the overthrow of war, and claiming that they could put an end to the whole barbaric business if only they would. Doubtless the statement is made chiefly from a recognition of the fact that women, holding in their hands the education of the race at its most plastic and formative period, exercise a great power in shaping the principles of each growing generation. But beside this there is the deeper, underlying thought, that it is the maternal element in humanity which stands for constructive, protective love; the love that is patient and long-suffering and forgiving. So to the mothers of the race, as the fullest recipients of this love, falls in large measure the beneficent task of counterbalancing the destructive, disruptive impulses of society.

We women would do well to take this thought to heart. We can indeed find no higher work than the inculcating of that spirit of peace and love, which shall hasten the coming of the time

"When the war-drums throb no longer, and the battle-flags are furled,

In the parliament of man, the federation of the world!"

Lost, Strayed or Stolen.

What has become of Arbitration? Is it lost, strayed or stolen? Two years ago it was at the head of the procession, waving its white banner, making itself glorious, greeted with applause. The platform and pulpit were proclaiming it; and great assemblies blessed it. A chief justice was brought across the ocean to set forth its beauties with his tongue of eloquence. The Senate was called upon to give it form and force in treaty. Its speedy coming to full power and grand consummation was ardently expected. The whole English-speaking world was reaching for its hand; and the good Briton, the good Scotchman, the good American, and, if there are any other good people in the world, were all crying, "Shake, shake!"

But one day a French captain came to a little town on the Nile, a wretched kind of a town in a poor, miserable country, and put up a flag. And then Arbitration vanished. Like Cicero's Catiline, it went, it left, it got out. Or, to use an expression less Ciceronian and more commonplace, it fell over itself in its hurry to depart. Nobody on the other side of the Atlantic, except a few Quakers and a pious person here and there, wanted it to stay. Everybody, that is, nearly everybody, wanted war and wanted it right away. That brash French captain must get out of Fashoda, or something awful would happen. The Tory said so, the Liberal said so, the churchman said so, the Nonconformist, who has a monopoly on the English conscience, said so, the fight-

ing squire and the fighting parson and all the boys and men said so. And then the factories began to hum, making powder, shells, bullets, anything that would kill a Frenchman; and the navy yards groaned with new labor and vast preparation to redden the sea with all the blood on the other side of the channel.

And poor old Arbitration! Out of a job, friendless and alone, it could not come to America, for we are not sure that we are through with Spain, or that we might not want to kill some insurgent Cubans or Filipinos, or some Indians, coal miners, or other people. But of course after the war is all over, we should be willing to take it in, that is, until we want to make another. In the meantime, however, Arbitration being by its lonely self, will have some time and more food for reflection. It can ask itself such questions as these: "When am I wanted? When am I needed, or when am I not needed? Who wants me, the peace-makers or the speech-makers? What do they want me for? For my blessings, or for buncombe? Does anybody really want me, except somebody who is afraid of getting whipped? Why should I be asked to step in to keep English-speaking people from cutting one another's throats, and not to keep a Briton from cutting a Frenchman's throat, or a Dervish's throat? Is it only difference of throats? Is it only a question of whose ox is to be impaled on the horn? *If the strongest party is always to decide what is just, right and honorable, where do I come in?* If the lion is determined to lie down with the lamb only when the lamb is inside, what is there for me to do? And what am I here for anyhow? Was I born too soon? Had I come into this world a century ahead of time? When they get through dividing Africa, and taking their several portions of China, and there is nothing more on land or sea to reach for, will they want me then? Or must I wait until invention has made an explosive which will blow up a continent at a shot, and the big powers are afraid to tackle one another, before I can get down to real business?"

But depressing as the present aspect may be to Arbitration itself, the peace-makers and the speech-makers and the good editors should not lose courage. The theme is still ample and inviting. It is good for pulpit discourse, for platform eloquence, for fine editorials and for the tons of resolutions in solemn assemblies. But all who hate war and love peace, and want Arbitration to get a good hold, go forward and come to an expected end, would do well to work hard on human nature. For with the present vast amount of human nature on both sides of the sea, and on all sides of all seas, it must be admitted that the climate is rather oppressive to Arbitration.—*The Advance*.

New Books.

SOUTH AMERICA. By Hezekiah Butterworth. New York: Doubleday & McClure.

This is one of the first attempts to write a connected story of the movement for freedom among the Spanish-American countries of South America. It is not, however, so much a history as an introduction to the history of South America. Mr. Butterworth prepared himself for writing the work by two trips into the republics whose history he sketches. He has a wide acquaintance with

the original authorities, and one wishes, as he follows the pages of the book, that the author had made more ample use of the abundant materials which were evidently at his hand. The work is written in a spirit of the utmost sympathy with the struggle of the countries south of us for freedom under the leadership of Bolivar and San Martin, and the reader will lay down the book with an increased desire to know more of the early history of the South American republics, some of which are soon to be so prominent in the world.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE SOCIAL STATE. By Rev. George C. Lorimer, D.D. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society.

This is one of the most important contributions to the literature of Christian Sociology which has recently appeared. Every page of it will be found instructive. The chapters on "Religion in Social Evolution," "The Conservation of the Individual," "The Socialistic Salvation," "Corporations and Co-operation," "Time and Taxes," "The Crime Against Humanity" (The Liquor Business), "The Redemption of Childhood" and "The Social Value of Liberty" are full not only of the truest Christian sentiment but of intelligent conception of the gravity of the evils now afflicting society, and of the methods by which alone they may be permanently cured.

The final chapter of the book treats of "The Passing of the War-God." Dr. Lorimer seems to believe in the essential incompatibility of war with Christianity, though he concedes with "sad perplexity" that war has been historically at times the scourge of God upon nations for their iniquity, that it has been an agency in human progress, even in the unfolding of the Christian faith. But after the attempt to justify it, its essential barbarism and unjustifiableness rush back upon him with such force that he confesses that "the cost both in life and treasure of warfare is such as to envelop the Christian mind in an agony of great darkness, even as our Saviour himself was oppressed by the blackness of the world's shame in the garden of Gethsemane." There seems to lurk in his mind a fear and doubt that his historic interpretation is not after all the right one, or not the complete one, and we believe that no truly Christian mind which attempts even partially to reconcile war with the teachings and spirit and mission of Jesus Christ will ever be able to rid itself of such feeling of perplexity. Light and darkness cannot be made to be alike.

But Dr. Lorimer believes most strongly that Christianity is ultimately to crush the war-god. It has already "diminished its rapaciousness and devilish cruelty." "Yes, the war-god trembles; the mailed deity will soon be deprived of worshipers. Like other infamous idolatries, the adoration offered at his shrine by ambition and cruelty shall be forever swept away. The war-god is passing, and though he passes through blood and flame, though he passes along a highway wet with tears, and his noisy alarm drum is drowned in the awful sounds of shrieks and groans of mutilated and agonized humanity—still he is passing, inevitably passing." The chief agency in putting an end to his reign, Dr. Lorimer believes will be "the common people, the lowly sons of toil, who will not long continue meekly to surrender themselves to butchery, besides putting their hands in their pockets to pay the bill."